

**The Idaho State Board of Education's
Limited English Proficiency (LEP) Sub Committee**

**Final Report
and
Recommendations**

JUNE 2005

Committee Members

Blake Hall, Chair
Paul Agidius
Marilyn Howard
Rod Lewis
Dianne Allen
Irene Chavolla
Linda Christensen
Saundra Deklotz

Ann Farris
Jose Garcia
Ted Garcia
Elmer Martinez
Don Peña
Rogelio Valdez
Delia Valdez
Wendy Verity

Table of Contents

LEP Sub Committee.....	Page 3
Background.....	Page 3
History of LEP Programming in Idaho.....	Page 4
Current Situation.....	Page 5
Issues and Recommendations for districts/schools to improve instruction and support services to better meet the needs of LEP student.....	Page 5
Issues and Recommendations for colleges/universities to improve teacher and administrator preparation programs to better serve LEP students	Page 12
Issues and Recommendations for the state to establish a statewide language proficiency test and accountability system for LEP students	Page 15
Sub Committee Final Meeting and Conclusions	Page 18
Appendix A: LEP Sub Committee Objectives and Accomplishments.....	Page 19
Appendix B: List of LEP Sub Committee Members.....	Page 20
Appendix C: Title III Accountability Measures.....	Page 21

LEP Sub Committee

In January 2004, the State Board of Education created an LEP Sub Committee to examine systems, procedures, methodologies, and best practices for the LEP programs in the State. The Sub Committee was commissioned to look at the overall learning environment for LEP students, to identify the gaps in programming, and provide recommendations for the State to move forward in serving these students. This document is the final report and recommendations set forth by the Committee to ensure that LEP students in Idaho achieve academically and linguistically and perform at the same level as all students. A full list of the Sub Committee's goals and accomplishments can be found in Appendix A.

Background

Each year, Idaho is faced with increasing numbers of Limited English Proficient (LEP) students, also referred to as English Language Learners (ELLs). However, not all ELLs are placed into a specific LEP program that is tied to State and Federal funding, due to parent waivers or fluency in the English language. Therefore, for the purposes of this document, LEP refers to those students identified and placed in a specific LEP program and ELL refers to any student who has a native language other than English, but is not necessarily placed in a program for funding. Districts reported 20,987 LEP students in May 2005. The State Board of Education estimates an increase of about 2000 new LEP students per year, based on the average increases over the past 10 years.

Over 80% of the LEP students in Idaho are Hispanic. In 2003-2004, 30.9% of the LEP students enrolled in services were classified as 'migrant students' (students who move with their parents either between states or districts in search of agricultural work). However, it is essential to note that there are students from over 90 countries in the schools throughout the State. This number is due to overall immigration, the international business presence in the area, the continuing refugee resettlement efforts and ongoing migrant work in agriculture and dairies. In the past years, groups from Bosnia, Afghanistan and Somalia have arrived. Several cities in Idaho have refugee resettlement agencies, therefore are considered in national refugee resettlement efforts. This trend will continue to significantly impact our school districts.

Several reviews and court decrees have sought to address the issues of the increasing number of LEP students and the achievement gap resulting from the lack of English language proficiency, formal schooling and poverty issues. The State Department of Education and the State Board of Education have begun the process of putting policies and procedures in place to build a solid foundation for these students and to address the issues set forth in the state legislative, court and Federal documents. In order to move the district LEP programs towards success, pivotal issues such as teacher training, district accountability, and funding adequacy must be addressed by the State.

History of LEP Programming in Idaho

Over the past decade, the Idaho State Department of Education managed the LEP program through Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) and through the Idaho Consent Decree, neither of which carried forceful accountability measures. In 2002, No Child Left Behind (NCLB) amended the ESEA through a consolidation of the discretionary Bilingual Education Program and the Emergency Immigrant Education Program into the new Title III State Formula Grant Program. With this reauthorization, new rules and regulations in the programming for LEP students were implemented that had not been required in the past.

It is important to note the magnitude of the change from Title VII to Title III. The Title III formula program grant replaced general grant funding for smaller and uncoordinated projects and services under Title VII. Title VII did not mandate a comprehensive program, but under Title III, States are required to develop a cohesive system of standards and assessments that meet the new NCLB requirements. The main NCLB requirements for LEP students are that districts must:

- (1) Provide a language development program that meets academic achievement standards and enables students being served to develop English proficiency;
- (2) Annually assess LEP students in language proficiency, report on growth data and be accountable for student growth;
- (3) Provide high quality professional development for teachers and administrators;
- (4) Promote parental and community participation in the LEP Programs.

Subsequently, in 2002, the Idaho State Department of Education's Federal Programs Bureau began to implement these new procedures and policies through the development of Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs), English language proficiency standards, data reporting systems and assistance with district LEP Plans. The LEP Plans are required by each district with LEP students to demonstrate how they will meet the requirements of the program.

Shortly after this reauthorization, which highlighted the gaps in LEP performance, the Idaho State Board of Education made the decision to administer the program out of the Office of the State Board of Education. The legislature and various Hispanic advocacy groups prompted the move in order for the Board to evaluate the LEP programming in the state, consider policy areas and develop cohesive programming. The LEP Sub Committee was established in January 2004 and a staff member was hired full time in April 2004 to manage the LEP Program. The LEP Program Manager has spent the last 12 months making progress towards Federal and State compliance, providing technical assistance for the LEP

programs in the State, and coordinating with the LEP Sub Committee to develop recommendations to the Idaho State Board of Education.

Current Situation

The LEP Sub Committee, through ongoing discussions, district visits, interviews and surveys, evaluated the current systems in place within the LEP framework. The Committee identified gaps, evaluated deficiencies and has come up with the following recommendations for the LEP Program. These recommendations are not intended to be an exhaustive list for all of the areas within minority and Hispanic education that need attention. Rather, they are meant to address the key issues that the Sub Committee believes must be addressed to move the state forward in closing the achievement gap for English language learners. The committee believes the changes or improvements needed in the LEP Program lie within the following areas:

- (1) For districts/schools – To improve instruction and support services to better meet the needs of LEP students;
- (2) For colleges/universities – To improve teacher and administrator preparation programs to better serve LEP students; and
- (3) For the state - To establish a statewide language proficiency test and accountability system for LEP students.

1. Issues and Recommendations for districts/schools to improve instruction and support services to better meet the needs of LEP students

Overview

Currently state and Title III Federal funds support Idaho's LEP students. Both funding sources bring rules and regulations with which the districts and schools with LEP students must comply. Information regarding the regulations has been disseminated to the districts in multiple ways (LEP Plan guidance, district visits, email communication and the LEP Website). Every district has the flexibility to implement the regulations in the manner that is the most successful and most feasible within the district. This has provided the districts with flexibility; however, many districts are still not in full compliance with implementing the program requirements and, ultimately, many students are still not getting the services they need.

Issues and Recommendations

As the term "best practices" circulates, NCLB language, teachers and administrators are seeking answers to what this means. The LEP Sub Committee recognizes that there is a lack of current research for "best practices" in the education of LEP students, as it is an under-identified field of research. Even

with much of the research supporting bilingual programs,¹ it is apparent that most Idaho districts do not have the financial and human resources to run comprehensive bilingual programs. However, research does indicate that there are specific practices that ensure a successful program if implemented fully and correctly and that “an ELL program model may be only as effective as the whole school within which it is implemented.”² The Sub Committee concurs that the following practices are essential to effective programming and are the key factors, or guiding principles, for any program in affecting achievement of English language learners.

- 1. Ongoing Professional Development**
- 2. Administrator support**
- 3. Parental involvement**
- 4. Usage of solid curriculum aligned with state standards**
- 5. Understanding demographics and culture**
- 6. Implementing LEP programming appropriate for LEP students**

These components are incorporated in Federal regulations of Title III programming; however, not all districts are implementing these components to the extent necessary to be effective. Therefore, the Sub Committee recommends specific change or improvements within the following areas to ensure that district and school services are positively effecting the achievement of LEP students.

Ongoing Professional Development

Title III, Section 3115(c)(2) states that districts must provide high-quality professional development to classroom teachers (including teachers in classroom settings that are not the settings of language instruction programs), principals, administrators, and other school or community-based organizational personnel. The professional development must be “of sufficient intensity and duration (which shall not include activities such as one-day or short-term workshops and conferences...unless the short term professional development is part of a long term comprehensive plan.”) The law also requires that professional development needs to be based on identified needs of the students and linked to long term planning.

Identified Gap: The LEP Sub Committee has identified that teachers and administrators are not sufficiently prepared for the influx of English language learners with specific instruction that is required for their success in school³. LEP students are served throughout the school; therefore everyone must be

¹ Collier, Virginia P and Thomas, Wayne P. “A National Study of School Effectiveness for Language Minority Students’ Long-Term Academic Achievement Final Report.” 1996-2001. George Mason University. http://www.crede.org/research/llaa/1.1_conclusions.html

² Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory. “English Language Learner Programs – Findings From Literature.” Portland, Oregon. 2004.

³ Also identified in 2002 by Gary R. Hargett. “Summary of Evaluation Report on State of Idaho Services to Hispanic LEP students.” 2002.

sufficiently prepared. If there are professional development opportunities within the districts, it is short term, usually revolving around workshops. Therefore, the Sub Committee believes the following recommendations will increase student performance in the classroom. Districts with a student population of under 1000 should join with another district to provide effective and explicit instruction for professional development, in order to share costs.

#1. General Recommendation: Designate at least one full in-service day per year for all teachers, aides, and staff to receive professional development/training to meet the academic and cultural needs of LEP students. This in-service day should cover school and districts' plans to meet the needs for LEP students, as well as address key instructional strategies for all teachers. Cultural awareness must also be addressed. Examples of successful strategies that can be integrated into a broader program are ESL strategies, the SIOP (Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol), GLAD (Guided Language Acquisition Design) and CALLA (Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach) methodologies. These sessions may also make up part of several instructional times, or multiple in-service days.

Responsibility: School administrators with assistance from district personnel.

Funding source: Title III, State LEP and general funds.

#2. General Recommendation: Require all teachers and administrators who interact with one or more LEP students to take at least 30 in-service hours, or three credit hours, of continuing education and/or re-certification in meeting the needs of LEP students. These hours should be focused on direct skills training and methodologies to serve LEP students. This requirement would be waived if a teacher/administrator has an endorsement in Bilingual/ESL Education.

Responsibility: School administrators, district offices, colleges/universities.

Funding Source: Title III, State LEP and general funds.

#3. Policy Recommendation: Train all teachers and paraprofessionals working specifically with LEP students, whether within an LEP Program or a mainstream class, a minimum of 8 hours in cultural competency, as well as in a methodology, such as the SIOP model, or in a program of equal scope and duration that addresses the needs of LEP students (GLAD, CALLA). Training should focus on how to incorporate a language objective in addition to the content objective for each lesson plan, as all classes use the English language as a means of instruction. This training should take place within 2 years of entering the teaching field. Teachers who have already been trained would be required to demonstrate the application of the methodology within their classroom.

Responsibility: School administrators/district offices may bring trainers into the district **or** send key teachers to a training of trainers course. Districts would be responsible in monitoring classroom application.

Funding Source: Title II teacher quality funds, district Title III and State LEP funds, district general funds. Title III and Title I-C Administration funds should be used for regional trainings, coordinated with the Northwest Regional Education Lab (NWREL).

#4. General Recommendation: Align professional development activities, for administrators, teachers and paraprofessionals, with the District LEP Plan. All professional development should be “of sufficient intensity and duration (which shall not include activities such as one-day or short-term workshops and conferences, [unless the workshop is one part of a long term professional development plan, established by a teacher and supervisor”] (NCLB Section 3115(c)(2)(D)). Professional development should include training in curriculum adaptation strategies and instructional accommodations, as well as methodologies referenced in recommendation #3.

Responsibility: District LEP Coordinator, Administrators.

Funding Source: Title I, Title III and State LEP funds.

Administrator Support

The LEP Sub Committee recognizes that one key to the success of teachers is a supportive, yet structured environment⁴. Any activity, training, curriculum, or methodology used within a district or school must be led and supported by the administration, inclusive of superintendents and principals.

Identified Gap: The LEP Sub Committee has identified through discussions with teachers in various districts, the issue of lack of administrator support as an area that is hindering LEP programming within the schools/districts. Many teachers are being trained in Bilingual/ESL education and are given tools to support the students, however when hired into districts they are not given the support from the administration they need to succeed.

#5. General Recommendation: Work with the State Department of Education to coordinate administrator trainings to address the specific areas of how to assist at risk students. The Association of Idaho Administrators should be informed, so that English language learner components can be included in their ongoing professional development program for administrators.

Responsibility: State LEP Program, SDE, and Idaho Association of Idaho Administrators.

Funding Source: Title III administrative funds, Title I funds.

Parental Involvement

Parental involvement is essential for student achievement. Students drop out of school because parents may not understand the educational system, economic issues, or students are not encouraged to stay in school and go to college. Much of this is because parents of LEP students may not understand the benefits of

⁴ Goldenberg, Claude. Successful School Change. Teachers College Press, New York, New York. 2004.

education and staying in school. In addition, some parents do not have a clear understanding of the American educational system or of the standards required for graduation. Title III requires, in section 3116, that local LEP Plans describe how the district will promote parental and community participation in programs for LEP students. As parents get more involved in their children's education, they will see the resources and benefits that an education has to offer.

Identified Gap: The LEP Sub Committee has identified that even though the districts are required to write a parental involvement section within their LEP Plan, many districts in effect, do little more than translate some of the documents that go home. Title III regulations mandate that all documents sent home are translated into the languages to the extent practicable and that parental involvement be much more comprehensive than solely notifications sent home.

#6. General Recommendation: Translate all documents sent home to parents into the various languages represented in the district, to the extent feasible. Distribute documents and notices in multiple forms such as, paper, electronic and through verbal communication.

Responsibility: Administrators, LEP teachers.

Funding Source: Title I, Title III funds, District general funds.

#7. General Recommendation: Provide common LEP program documents, including translations, on the LEP website for districts to access.

Responsibility: State LEP Program.

Funding Source: Title III administrative funds.

#8. Policy Recommendation: Develop a parent advisory council, in collaboration with the Title I programs, within Title III districts that have at least 5%, or a significant population of LEP students. This council should meet regularly (monthly or quarterly) to develop outreach plans, activities and literacy assistance for parents in the area. Districts are recommended to provide their parent advisory councils with a culturally relevant and effective parent involvement training program that has been demonstrated to increase parental understanding of the educational system, and that has resulted in LEP student academic success, increased high school graduation, and increases in the number of LEP students going on to higher education. The council should be representative of the demographics of the student population in the district. The State LEP Program should help districts with identifying parent involvement training models or programs available.

Responsibility: District office, school administrators.

Funding Source: District Title III, State LEP, Title I and general funds.

Usage of Solid Curriculum Aligned with State Standards

NCLB discusses the need for districts to improve the instructional program for LEP students "by identifying, acquiring, and upgrading curricula, instructional materials, educational software and assessment procedures." (Section

3115(d)(2)). In addition, NCLB requires that LEP students be measured according to the achievement assessment. Therefore, solid content-based curriculum is essential in providing the LEP students with the tools they need to succeed in Idaho schools.

Identified Gap: The LEP Sub Committee has identified that many districts and schools are using ad hoc resources for their LEP students and programming. Much of the curriculum is not aligned to state standards and many questions are asked about what curriculum districts should implement. The State will only be able to recommend specific curriculum through the **curriculum adoption process** every year in June. More information can be found at: <http://www.sde.state.id.us/instruct/Curriculum/>. The recommend curriculum is aligned with the State's English language proficiency (ELP) Standards, which are based on the Idaho Content Standards. The LEP Sub Committee recognizes that the curriculum must be based on content, and in addition, the content classes incorporate language objectives, since all classes use the English language as a means of instruction.

#9. General Recommendation: Consider using the State funded Plato I-PLN (Idaho Plato Learning Network) program in assisting LEP students with supplemental instruction. Plato Learning's I-PLN is a computer based courseware available to Idaho school districts to assist in many different areas. The I-PLN does not replace direct instruction for LEP students and can be the one source for supplemental instruction for LEP students.

Responsibility: School administrators, District offices.

Funding Source: NA- The I-PLN is funded.

Understanding of Demographics and Culture

Districts must be able to identify who their students are in order to provide appropriate services. Many students in Idaho are coming from a multitude of circumstances that have either positively or negatively affected their level of education. Research states that student variables may affect academic success⁵. Therefore, it is essential that districts are aware of whether a particular student or group of students has had previous formal education, is literate or not, and what the cultural norms are for the ethnic group(s), etc.

Identified Gap: The LEP Sub Committee has identified an increasing number of students from many different countries. Not all students have the same educational background and therefore cannot be given identical services to other LEP students. Even districts that have Spanish as the dominant minority language, cannot assume that all students can be given the same instruction. Many Spanish-speaking students come from different countries and different circumstances.

⁵ Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory. "English Language Learner Programs – Findings From Literature." Portland, Oregon. 2004. Page 32.

#10. Policy Recommendation: Report annually on the overall demographics in the district LEP Plans and data collections. Student reports should be disaggregated by ethnicity and country of origin.

Responsibility: District LEP Coordinators.

Funding Source: Title III, State LEP funds.

#11. General Recommendation: Use data from LEP student assessments to identify areas for differentiating instruction.

Responsibility: School administrators, teachers.

Funding Source: Title I, Title III and State LEP funds.

#12. General Recommendation: Work with the Special Education Department and Gifted and Talented Program to define the process for identifying and serving LEP students with special needs. The current identification process is vague and special education services provided for LEP students are not consistent.

Responsibility: State LEP Program, SDE- Special Education, Gifted and Talented Program.

Funding Source: Title I, Title III and Special Education funds.

Implementing LEP programming appropriate for LEP students

One main area that was highlighted in NCLB is the necessity to address the specific needs of English language learners and to serve them according to those needs. Before the reauthorization of the ESEA, LEP students only received ad hoc services. With new accountability measures for LEP students to meet language acquisition and content area objectives, researchers, including school districts themselves, are realizing what works and what does not work in the comprehensive education of English language learners.

Identified Gap: The LEP Sub Committee identified districts in Idaho, such as Murtaugh, that are implementing Pre-K and/or full day Kindergarten for their LEP students. These districts are achieving high success in teaching children English. The extra time for language instruction and literacy development is key for the younger LEP students, so they are able to read at grade level by grade 3. Research states that high-quality preschool programs and full day kindergarten⁶ are successful mechanisms for achieving the goal of early literacy. However, there is no specific funding for these programs; most districts are unable to implement these early childhood development programs.

#13. General Recommendation: Consider using LEP and Title III funds for Pre – K and full day Kindergarten to specifically address English Language Learners.

Responsibility: School administrators, legislators

Funding Source: General funds, Title III and State LEP funds.

⁶ Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory. "Full Day Kindergarten: Exploring an Option for Extended Learning." <http://www.nwrel.org/request/dec2002/kindergarten.pdf>

Identified Gap: Programming for LEP students can no longer be separated from the general education. As the number of LEP students increases each year and accountability measures for LEP students span language and content objectives, LEP students must learn Reading, Math, Science, History, take P.E., etc., as they simultaneously learn English. Because of this, LEP services must be integrated into all classes. Many programs, assessments and interventions do not take into consideration the special needs of English language learners, leading to one reason why these students are being left behind.

#14. General Recommendation: Design and implement all programs (e.g. Reading First, Early Start, school improvement plans, State Department of Education Academies, school-wide school plans, professional development plans, coordination of federal and state programs with LEP Program, etc) with consideration for LEP students.

Responsibility: All State Department of Education programs, State LEP Program, district and school administrators.

Funding Source: Title I, Title III and State LEP funds, and general district funds.

2. Issues and Recommendations for colleges/universities to improve teacher and administrator preparation programs to better serve LEP students

Overview

In order to provide for the influx of English language learners in Idaho, the institutions of higher education must seek to increase the number of teachers certified in Bilingual/ English as a Second Language (ESL) education and to incorporate cross cultural teaching and ESL instructional methods for all prospective teachers. The preparation for certification must be appropriate not only to the research and trends in Bilingual/ESL education, but also to what the realities are of teaching LEP students in Idaho schools. Several universities/colleges in Idaho have established programs for Bilingual/ instruction, many with assistance from the legislative “Grow Your Own” program, which provides scholarships to paraprofessionals working with Bilingual/ESL, so that they become certified and stay in Idaho to teach.

Issues and Recommendations

It is clear that the colleges/universities play an important role in the preparation of Idaho’s future teachers and administrators. It is key that the State Board of Education and the institutions of higher education continually collaborate to meet the current and future needs of the LEP student populations. The State Board of Education’s LEP Program conducted a survey of the universities to understand what types of classes and curriculum the institutions of higher education provide. Through this survey and discussions with teachers in Idaho, the LEP Sub Committee identified gaps in the education of Bilingual/ESL students, as well as

in the general education and administration curriculum in providing the appropriate services for the needs of our LEP student population today.

Identified Gap: Quite possibly no other program under the ESEA was as radically changed in the reauthorization to No Child Left Behind as the Title III program for LEP students. The change in the law brought rules and regulations to hold states and districts accountable for serving a subgroup that had previously only been provided ad hoc services. The understanding of the new law is essential in successfully working with LEP programs in any school. The LEP Sub Committee identified through surveys and discussions with teachers in the field, that there is a lack of instruction, for future Bilingual/ESL teachers, general education teachers, and future administrators regarding (1) English language learner issues and laws and (2) the administration of Federal programs, inclusive of providing standards based education. It was also identified that heavy emphasis is placed on Bilingual education theory, rather than hands-on ESL strategies and methodologies, focused on serving students from diverse backgrounds.

#15. Policy Recommendation: Perform a program self-evaluation of the education and Bilingual/ESL programs, concerning how the schools of education are addressing the needs of LEP students in the state. The self-evaluation will also provide information on how the programs are meeting the recommendations for colleges/universities within this document. A committee focused on English language learner issues will review program evaluations and report back to the colleges/universities on deficiencies and areas to be addressed. Programs will subsequently develop a plan and realign curriculum describing institutional efforts to increase/modify services in order to meet the needs of Idaho school districts and LEP students.

Responsibility: College of Education Deans, department heads.

Funding Source: College/university funds.

#16. General Recommendation: Work with teacher education deans in Idaho to promote a broad based understanding of issues pertaining to English language learners and the importance of providing specific courses for administrators and general education teachers.

Responsibility: State LEP program, OSBE Chief Academic Officer, College of Education Deans.

Funding Source: Title III administration funds.

#17. General Recommendation: Offer methodology classes, such as ESL strategies, SIOP, CALLA, GLAD, as well as standards-based education, in order to meet the needs of LEP students within the current operating environment of NCLB.

Responsibility: College/university education and Bilingual/ESL programs.

Funding Source: College/university funds.

#18. General Recommendation: Provide instruction within general education and Bilingual/ESL programs to address the administration of federal programs, inclusive of the Office of Civil Rights (OCR), Title I and Title III regulations for LEP students.

Responsibility: College of Education Deans.

Funding Source: College/university funds.

#19. General Recommendation: Provide instruction within general education programs for all teacher and administrator candidates on language learner issues and laws and how to work with diverse student populations, beyond general multicultural education classes. Specific strategies should be addressed for providing accommodations for ELL students within the classroom, assignments and activities.

Responsibility: College of Education Deans.

Funding Source: College/university funds.

#20. General Recommendation: Provide specific instruction within Bilingual/ESL programs for language acquisition that includes a phonics-based approach.

Responsibility: College of Education Deans.

Funding Source: College/university funds.

#21. General Recommendation: Provide instruction within general education and Bilingual/ESL programs regarding standards-based curriculum and standards-based lesson planning to all future teachers, taking into consideration the English language proficiency (ELP) standards in listening, reading, speaking and writing.

Responsibility: College of Education Deans.

Funding Source: College/university funds.

#22. General Recommendation: Provide instruction to all education students regarding the I-PLN program, as all colleges/universities have complete access to the I-PLN program.

Responsibility: College of Education Deans.

Funding Source: College/university funds.

Identified Gap: Currently there is a shortage of certified Bilingual/ESL teachers in the schools in Idaho to meet the needs of the growing ELL population. In addition, under NCLB, LEP students must learn content at the same time they are learning English. Therefore there is a gap not only with needing to retain more certified Bilingual/ESL teachers, but there is also a lack of teachers who are qualified in a content area as well as in Bilingual/ESL instruction. More incoming students need to be given incentives for going into Bilingual/ESL education, in addition to obtaining a content area certification, and also incentives for staying in Idaho to teach. The LEP Sub Committee recognizes the success of the Grow

Your Own Program and the importance of providing institutions with funds to distribute scholarships in this area. In addition, the Transition to Teaching and State Agency of Higher Education (SAHE) Teacher grants have helped provide incentives for Bilingual/ESL teachers in content instruction in Idaho.

#23. General Recommendation: Increase funding to institutions of higher education for scholarships in order to enable Bilingual/ESL program expansion and outreach to students desiring to teach in Idaho and to encourage students to be certified in a content area in addition to receiving an endorsement in Bilingual/ESL education.

Responsibility: Idaho legislature, college/university education programs.

Funding Source: Legislative funds.

3. Issues and Recommendations for the state to establish a statewide language proficiency test and accountability system for LEP students

Overview:

NCLB mandates that all states implement certain requirements, including a single statewide English Language Proficiency (ELP) assessment for LEP students by spring 2006. In addition, states are required to develop annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs), holding LEP students accountable for growth and proficiency in language development. These AMAOs are to be aligned with the ELP Standards and the state ELP assessment. The AMAOs will also be directly correlated with policy regarding number of years allowable for students to be in an LEP program, as well as district funding determinations.

Idaho is in the process of developing the statewide ELP assessment. After the first implementation year, cut scores for the assessment will be developed and the current AMAOs will be aligned with the single statewide language proficiency assessment.

Identified Gap: The State Board of Education will contract a test vendor in June 2005 to develop a language proficiency test, appropriate to Idaho, using test items developed by the Mountain West Assessment Consortium (MWAC). The contract will include an alignment study to determine the percentage of the test linked to the English language proficiency standards, subsequent alignment, printing/distribution, administration and scoring of the assessment.

The annual contract for a test vendor is estimated at \$500,000 for the first year, with out-year development potentially lower. Title VI Assessment funds, totaling up to \$500,000 are reserved in FY06 budget for Year 1 of the ELP Assessment Contract. However, Title IV funds are fully allocated for the next 5 years to other priorities with the ISAT. Therefore it is necessary to determine the funding source for the annual English language proficiency test. Since this is a

mandatory statewide assessment, the LEP Sub Committee has determined that it should be annually funded by the state.

#24. General Recommendation: Seek, from the legislature, an estimated additional \$275,000 per year for LEP administrative funds, in addition to the annual increases in the budget for per student funding, for the contractor costs associated with the annual development, administration, and scoring of the English language proficiency assessment.

Responsibility: Legislature. Office of the State Board of Education.

Funding Source: Additional allocation of legislative funds for the LEP program.

Identified Gap: The State Board of Education has determined that NCLB accountability measures apply to all districts, inclusive of those that do not receive Federal funding. However, it has not been articulated that Title III regulations apply to all districts as well, as this directive was based on Title I accountability.

Implementing a statewide accountability system, within the LEP program, would provide consistency with information sharing, programmatic guidance, reporting of information from districts (data collection) and reporting to the State Legislature and U.S. Department of Education. Specific Federal accountability measures can be found in Appendix C.

If Idaho chooses to not apply Title III accountability measures to all districts with LEP students, the state will have to develop an alternate system of accountability for those districts only receiving state LEP funds.

#25. Policy Recommendation: Apply Title III regulations and accountability to all districts with LEP students.

Responsibility: State LEP Program.

Funding Source: Title III, State LEP funds.

Identified Gap: Currently the Rules Governing Thoroughness, Section 111.04.c *Assessment in the Public Schools*, states that LEP students may be considered for an LEP program for no longer than 7 years (inclusive of the mandatory 2 years of monitoring).

This year determination for the LEP Program was taken from Title I, Section 1111(b)(3)(C)(ix)(III). However the Federal law was interpreted incorrectly and it was actually for LEP students to take an *alternate* Standard Achievement Test. This alternate assessment would be a native language version of the ISAT, which Idaho has decided to not implement. An LEP student may take the ISAT with accommodations until they test proficient on a language proficiency test and exit the program. In addition, OCR and the Idaho Consent decree state that an LEP student may be in a program until they are proficient in English.

Idaho will seek to align the specific number of years an LEP student can be in a program, with language proficiency levels and growth targets after the first ELP assessment is administered and baseline data are gathered.

#26. Policy Recommendation: Remove the limit of 7 years in an LEP program, under the assessment section 111.04.c in the Rules Governing Thoroughness, State Board of Education. Subsequently, realign the Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives for the LEP programs and make a determination for how many years a student should feasibly be in an LEP program. The determination will be in direct alignment with the statewide assessment and objectives for growth, so that educators in Idaho are working within a standard rubric. The aligned programming components will be proposed to the Board in a new *LEP Program* section within the Rules Governing Thoroughness.

Responsibility: State LEP Program, ELP assessment vendor.

Funding Source: Title IV, Title III funds.

Sub Committee Final Meeting and Conclusions

The committee proposed the following in the final meeting, dated May 18, 2005, in order to ensure the next steps for the *LEP Sub Committee Final Report and Recommendations* document.

General Follow Up

- Send the recommendations document to the State Board of Education for approval as an overall recommendations document with consideration to follow up on the policy recommendations indicated within the document.
- Distribute the recommendations document to districts, universities, and other stakeholders encouraging consideration.
- Seek, from the legislature, an estimated additional \$275,000 per year for LEP administrative funds, in addition to the annual increases in the budget for per student funding, for the contractor costs associated with the annual development, administration, and scoring of the English language proficiency assessment.

Policy Consideration

The LEP Sub Committee recommended six (6) recommendations to be considered as policy. With Board agreement, the LEP Program will work with key stakeholders to develop the recommendations into policy agenda items for Board approval. The items are defined as "Policy Recommendations" within the document (Recommendations: #3, #8, #10, #15, #25, #26).

Program Standards

The LEP Program Manager will ensure that requirements and recommendations for successful LEP Programs are distributed to districts serving LEP students:

- Prepare an LEP Program Standards document/LEP Program Manual for districts.

Performance Measures

The LEP Program will ensure a system of measuring district progress and integration of the Board recommendations:

- Monitor LEP students' English Language Proficiency (ELP) test scores;
- Monitor LEP students' ISAT scores;
- Provide comprehensive district monitoring to ensure that the appropriate programs and policies are in place within the district to support LEP student learning.

Appendix A: LEP Sub Committee Objectives and Accomplishments

Objectives	Accomplishments
To conduct a review of initiatives, legislation, funding or other actions taken in the state of Idaho to address educational gaps in minority student performance.	The Sub Committee reviewed the initiatives in the state of Idaho, including HB 787, the Consent Decree, legislative annual funding and the Blue Ribbon report.
To identify research-based approaches to English language acquisition and improved academic performance for target populations.	Professionals presented the SIOP (Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol) to the Committee. This level of instruction is an overall approach to teaching students who are limited in their English ability within content classes. The Sub Committee noted that all districts have different needs and limitations, therefore the district focus should be on “successful practices”, inclusive of ongoing professional development with a model that suits their needs (such as the SIOP), administrator support, parental involvement, good curriculum, understanding district demographics.
Create a consistent mechanism for sharing of best practices in language acquisition and academic performance enhancement with local school districts.	The LEP Program developed an LEP web page on the Board of Education’s website, where district administrators and teachers have access to key documents, information, best practices, methodologies, etc. In addition, regional meetings are conducted annually providing program updates and successful strategies.
Increase the number of public teachers specifically trained to meet the needs of the target population.	The Office of the State Board of Education incorporated into SAHE (State Agency for Higher Education) Title II funding a priority for addressing English language learners’ needs for all teachers or the possibility of providing instruction for teachers in one or more approaches/models of instruction for English language learners. The LEP Program conducted a Higher Education Bilingual/ESL survey to address the successes and gaps within the Bilingual/ESL programs in the State.
Review and make recommendations to the Board regarding specific policy items.	In June 2004, the Sub Committee reviewed and recommended the English Language Proficiency Standards, that the Department had developed, for Board Approval
Review and make recommendations for the LEP Program regarding the LEP Program Action Plan, including challenges facing the LEP program.	In November 2004, the Sub Committee recommended actions for the LEP Program, as well as made recommendations regarding key challenges within the LEP Program. In May 2005, the Sub Committee reviewed and recommended to the Board a paper discussing key issues and recommendations for the LEP program.

Appendix B: List of LEP Sub Committee Members

NAME	TITLE	LOCATION
Delia Valdez	Principal Mountain View Elem. School	Burley
Linda Christensen	LEP Director -- Title 1 & ELL Meridian School District	Meridian
Ann Farris	Federal Programs Supervisor Boise Public Schools	Boise
Rogelio Valdez	Director Disability Determinations Department of Labor	Boise
Don Peña	Director of Education, Employment & Training Idaho Migrant Council	Caldwell
Ted & Josie Garcia	Owners, Angela's Restaurant Rupert	Rupert
Irene Chavolla	Coordinator, Migrant Education State Department of Education	Boise
Dianne Allen	Former Education Coordinator for the Coeur d'Alene Tribe	DeSmet
Elmer Martinez	Representative Legislature	Pocatello
Blake Hall	Member State Board of Education	Idaho Falls
Paul Agidius	Member State Board of Education	Moscow
Marilyn Howard	State Superintendent of Public Instruction	Boise
Rod Lewis	President State Board of Education	Boise
Wendy Verity	Limited English Proficiency Mgr State Board of Education	Boise
Saundra DeKlotz	Federal Programs Manager State Board of Education	Boise

Appendix C: Title III Accountability Measures

Under Title III, Districts are held accountable to **(NCLB, Title III, section 3122(b))** and measured according to:

1. Annual increases in the percent or number of LEP students making progress in acquiring English language proficiency.
2. Annual increases in the percent or number of LEP students attaining English language proficiency by the end of the school year, as determined by an English language proficiency assessment.
3. Making AYP (adequate yearly progress) on the spring ISAT for LEP students (section 1111(b)(2)(B)).

Title III Accountability Measures

A. If a district LEP program fails to make progress toward meeting these objectives for two (2) consecutive years, the State Board of Education will work with the district to develop an improvement plan that specifically addresses the factors that prevented the district from achieving the objectives.

B. If a district LEP program fails to meet these objectives for four (4) consecutive years, the State Board of Education will either require the district to modify the curriculum and LEP program OR will make a funding determination and require the district to replace educational personnel.

C. Parental Notification – Sec 3302(b)

In addition to providing the general parental notifications, each district that has failed to make progress on the annual measurable achievement objectives for any fiscal year, shall separately inform a parent or the parents of a child identified for participation or participating in such program of such failure within 30 days.